



State of New Jersey

Christine Todd Whitman
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Robert C. Shinn, Jr.
Commissioner

Ms. Carole Petersen, Chief
New Jersey Remediation Branch
USEPA Region 2
290 Broadway
New York, NY 10007-1866

OCT 26 1999

Dear Ms. Petersen:

Re: L.E. Carpenter Superfund Site
Wharton, Morris County

The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (Department) is in receipt of your letter dated October 19, 1999 regarding EPA's comments not being included in the Department's September 30, 1999 letter to the Potentially Responsible Party (PRP) on the *Further Off-Site Groundwater Investigation at MW19/Hot Spot 1 Workplan*. The Department provided a response to EPA's comments in a letter dated October 12, 1999 that explained the Department's reasons why EPA's comments were excluded. Regarding EPA's concerns about vertical delineation, the Department responded "once the contamination is delineated, if the Department believes deeper wells are required for vertical delineation, the Responsible Party will be requested to install these additional wells." The October 12, 1999 letter is enclosed for your convenience.

As you are aware, the Department is the lead agency for this site, and as such may exclude comments from EPA that are not appropriate or applicable. It should be noted that EPA's previous comments (provided in the December 4, 1998 letter) regarding the delineation of this area of concern were provided to the PRP in a letter dated December 21, 1998. EPA requested that the PRP conduct a groundwater screening investigation (i.e., use of a geoprobe, hydro punch, or other similar methodology) prior to the installation of the monitoring wells. Due to the geology in the area (i.e., boulders), the groundwater screening investigation could not be fully implemented. Because of EPA's request that a groundwater screening investigation be conducted before the installation of the wells, a great deal of time and money were wasted.

It should also be noted that many of EPA's comments show a lack of understanding about the conditions at the site, the contaminants of concern, and previous investigations that have been conducted. In addition to the groundwater screening investigation example presented above, in EPA's July 23, 1999 letter regarding the MW19/Hot Spot 1 area of concern, it was requested that samples be analyzed for MTBE. The tanks in this area only contained MEK, waste MEK and waste pigments; clearly MTBE is of no concern. In EPA's August 12, 1999 letter regarding the July 1999 Quarterly Monitoring Report, EPA requested that the channel next to the site be resampled since "...it has been



over five years since the RI, and the possibility exists that with LNAPL in site groundwater, discharge to the channel could have increased..." This resampling had been conducted in May, 1998 as per the Department's request, and EPA had a copy of the results of this investigation, which showed there was no contamination in this channel.

Consequently, the Department is hesitant to forward many of EPA's comments to the PRP. However, in future letters that the Department sends to the PRP that exclude EPA's comments, a sentence will be included that states that EPA provided comments, however the Department chose not to include them. If the PRP requests EPA's comments, a copy will be forwarded.

In the future it will be appreciated if issues such as these could be discussed over the telephone prior to the exchange of written correspondence. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this issue further, please contact me or have your staff contact Gwen Zervas at (609) 633-7261.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce Venner".

Bruce Venner, Chief
Bureau of Case Management

C: Kim O'Connell
Stephen Cipot